REMARKS

Claims 1 - 6 and 8 - 29 are pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration for at least the following reasons.

A. Rejections Under § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. In particular, it was pointed out that the method recited in the preamble that this was for an optical fiber cable system, yet the method did not allegedly show any interaction between optical fibers and the drawer system.

Although Applicants disagree with this rejection and believe that the claim was perfectly clear and complied with the definiteness requirement of § 112, second paragraph, Applicants have amended claim 13 to address the concerns raised in the Office Action. In particular, Applicants have amended claim 13 to recite that the first chassis and drawer define a storage interior for holding optical fiber cable, and the second chassis and drawer define a storage interior for holding optical fiber cable. It is noted that this claim was not rejected over prior art. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is allowable. Claim 14 depends upon and further limits claim 13. It is respectfully submitted that claim 14 should also be allowable at least for depending upon an allowable independent claim.

B. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that claims 11, 12, and 15 - 23 were allowed.

The Office Action indicated that claim 7 contained allowable subject matter. Applicants have canceled original claim 7. Applicants have rewritten original claim 7 into independent form as new claim 24. It is respectfully submitted that new claim 24 is allowable. New claim 25 depends upon and further limits claim 24. It is thus submitted that claim 25 should also be allowable.

C. New Claims 26 - 29

Applicants have submitted new claims 26 - 29. New independent claim 26 includes some of the limitations from original claim 7. New claim 26, however, does not include all of the limitations of intervening claims between original claim 1 and original claim 7. New claim 26 includes, for example, that the cover member includes a finger having an attachment portion pivotally securing the finger to the frame piece. The attachment portion is recited as including a pair of tabs projecting from the finger. Applicants believe that the invention of claim 26 is not disclosed or suggested in U.S. Patent No. 5,240,209 to Kutsch; U.S. Patent No. 6,044,194 to Meyerhoefer; or any of the art of record. For example, it is believed that none of the art of record includes, in combination, a frame piece and a cover member having a cable entry aperture, as defined by the claim, and further including a finger with an attachment portion including a pair of tabs projecting from the finger. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 26 should be allowable. Claims 27 and 28 depend upon and further limit claim 26. Applicants, thus, contend that claims 27 and 28 should also be allowable at least for depending upon an allowable independent claim.

New claim 29 is a method claim dependent upon claim 10. Applicants discuss below reasons why independent method claim 8 is allowable. In addition to the reasons (discussed below) for the allowability of claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent method claim 29 should be allowable. Dependent method claim 29 recites that the step of rotating the cover member about a hinge point includes rotating a pair of tabs projecting from the cover member about a portion of the frame piece. It is believed that these limitations are similar to some of the limitations of the type indicated allowable by the Examiner in original claim 7. It is noted that new claim 29 does not include all of the limitations of claim 7 and the intervening claims between original claim 7 and claim 1.

D. Rejections Under § 103

Claims 1 - 6 and 8 - 10 were rejected under § 103 as unpatentable over Kutsch '209 in view of Meyerhoefer '194. Applicants disagree with this rejection. In reviewing, collectively, the teachings of Kutsch '209 and Meyerhoefer '194, one of ordinary skill would not have had the motivation to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Office Action. It appears

that the only motivation would have been from Applicants' very own disclosure that teaches the invention.

To further clarify the invention, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8. Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the frame piece is a continuously curved wall with a continuous trough section. The trough section is further defined by the vertically oriented wall and a base, with the base bridging the vertically oriented wall and the curved wall. The base is defined as being continuous with the vertically oriented wall and the curved wall. One embodiment of this frame piece is shown, for example, by FIGS. 2, 3, and 6. In FIG. 3, for example, the continuously curved wall and continuous trough section is shown in plan view.

Method claim 8 was amended to further clarify that the radius limiter includes a frame piece with a vertically oriented continuously curved wall and a continuous trough section. The optical fiber is oriented within the continuous trough section and against the continuous curved wall.

Kutsch '209 and Meyerhoefer '194, separately or together, do not disclose or suggest the inventions of claims 1 and 8. For example, in Kutsch '209, the Office Action pointed out that Kutsch uses a plurality of linked members that can pivot relative to each other. Kutsch' 209 does not disclose or suggest, among other things, a frame piece having a continuously curved wall and a continuous trough section, with a base bridging the vertical wall and the curved wall, and with the base being continuous with the vertical wall and the curved wall, as defined by the claim. Meyerhoefer '194 does not help in this regard.

Similarly, with respect to claim 8, Kutsch '209 does not include a radius limiter having a vertically oriented continuous curved wall and a continuous trough section, of the type recited in claim 8. Kutsch '209 does not disclose or suggest orienting optical fiber cables within a continuous trough section and against the continuous curved wall.

At least for the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 8 are allowable. Claims 2 - 6 depend upon and further limit claim 1. Claims 9, 10, and 29 depend upon and further limit claim 8. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that each of dependent claims 2 - 6, 9, 10, and 29 are also allowable.

E. Summary

In summary, claims 1 - 6 and 8 - 29 are pending. Many of the claims have already been indicated as having allowable subject matter. The rest of the claims have been amended in a fashion to address the concerns of the Office Action. Thus, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration and a Notice of Allowability.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: 12 September 2002

Julie R. Daulton
Reg. No. 36,414
JRD:st

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

1. (Amended) A radius limiter for an optical fiber cable management panel; the radius limiter comprising:

(a) a frame piece including a vertically oriented continuous curved wall; and a continuous trough section adjacent to said curved wall;

(i) said curved wall being concavely shaped relative to said trough section; [and]

(ii) said trough section being defined by a vertically oriented wall and a base;

(A) said base bridging said vertically oriented wall and said curved wall;

(B) said base being continuous with said vertically oriented wall and said curved wall;

(b) a cover member oriented at least partially over the trough section;

(i) said cover member and said frame piece defining a cable entry aperture having a closed perimeter;

(A) said cable entry aperture being in communication with said trough section to permit cables to enter through the aperture and rest within the trough section;

(B) at least 75% of said perimeter of said cable entry aperture being circumscribed by a flared cable guide surface.

5. (Amended) A radius limiter according to claim 4 wherein:

(a) [said trough section is defined by a vertically oriented wall and a base;

(i) said base bridging said vertically oriented wall and said curved wall; and

(b)] said finger includes a second free edge selectively engaging said vertically oriented wall of said trough section;

(i) said latch arrangement being mounted on said vertically oriented wall and said second free edge to releasably secure said finger to said frame piece.

8. (Amended) A method of limiting a radius of optical fiber cables; the method comprising:

(a) providing a radius limiter including:

(i) a frame piece including a vertically oriented continuous curved wall; and a continuous trough section adjacent to the curved wall;

(ii) a cover member oriented at least partially over the trough section;

(A) the cover member defining at least a portion of a perimeter of a cable entry aperture;

(B) the portion of the perimeter of the cable entry aperture defined by the cover having a flared cable guide surface;

(b) directing optical fiber cables through the cable entry aperture and against the flared cable guide surface of the cover member; and

(c) after said step of directing, orienting the optical fiber cables within the continuous trough section and against the continuous curved wall.

13. (Amended) A method of connecting a first drawer assembly to a second drawer assembly in an optical fiber cable management system; the method comprising:

(a) providing a first and second drawer assembly; the first drawer assembly including a first drawer slidably received by a first chassis; the second drawer assembly including a second drawer slidably received by a second chassis; [and]

(i) the first chassis and first drawer defining a first storage interior for holding optical fiber cable;

(ii) the second chassis and second drawer defining a second storage interior for holding optical fiber cable; and

(b) securing a bracket to the first chassis and the second chassis by inserting a non-threaded stud arrangement into an aperture arrangement.

New claims 24 - 29 have been added.